



COUNCIL  
ON

# : Social Work Education

BIMONTHLY NEWS PUBLICATION

VOL. VII, No. 4

**SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT**

AUGUST, 1959

## FACING THE REALITIES OF FINANCING SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

Ann Elizabeth Neely\*  
Consultant on Program Services  
Council on Social Work Education

The United States makes a total annual investment of \$23 billion in its vast network of health and welfare services designed to improve the well-being of our nation. \$Nine-teen billion of this amount comes from taxes, and the remainder from private contributions including foundation grants.

If this amount is invested each year, then it is important from a sound business point of view, if for no other reason, to see that the money is well spent by workers adequately prepared and competent to administer these programs, and to offer the quality of services needed by those who turn to our social agencies for help with problems they are unable to carry or to solve alone.

It is a well known fact that the number of professionally qualified social workers is in short supply and the need continues to be acute. The demand far exceeds the supply and undoubtedly will continue to do so for many years to come. Recruitment of personnel with the educational qualifications and personality characteristics deemed essential for social work practice, and the educational preparation of these workers to meet the demanding responsibilities they face, becomes of paramount importance.

Since 1953 the Council on Social Work Education has carried on an active recruitment program, the objectives of which have been to interpret to high school and college students, their parents and vocational counselors the career opportunities social work offers, and to increase the number of students entering graduate schools of social work. This year enrollment in the 55 graduate schools in the United States and the 7 in Canada is at an all-time high--4,942 full time students and more than 5,000 additional students taking part time work. This full time enrollment represents a gain of 9% over last year and an increase of 27% since 1954 when the decline in enrollment was finally reversed.

In 1956 schools in the United States and Canada estimated that, with their existing faculty, facilities, and field instruction resources, they could enroll a total of 5,175 students. Enrollment figures this year, 4,942, indicate that this capacity figure has almost been reached and that, therefore, many schools will need to face, in the immediate future, a necessary expansion of faculty and facilities in order to meet increased enrollment and the problem of finding the money to cover the cost required for such expansion.

Reliable data regarding the cost of one year of professional education have never been assembled. The committee planning this session decided, however, that it was important to use whatever data are available, or could be secured for the special purpose of this meeting, in order to examine some of the issues we face in considering the cost of professional education today. What, for example, does it cost the school, the university and

\* Presented at an Associate Group Meeting, National Conference on Social Welfare, May 28, 1959.

the agency to provide one year of professional education? What does it cost the student? What role does government play in financing social work education? What is the responsibility of the community? There are no easy answers to these questions, for no one knows the national average annual cost of educating a social worker or, for that matter, a member of any other profession.

The first section of the paper will deal with the cost to the school, including the cost to the agency offering field instruction for one year of graduate professional education. The second section will deal with the costs to the student. In the latter part of the paper, questions relating to financial aid, and the responsibility of the community will be covered briefly.

# I. What is the Total Cost to the School, the University, and the Agency per Student for One Year of Graduate Professional Education?

One of the first questions that might be raised is, what does it cost to operate a graduate school of social work of the minimal optimum size?

In 1951 Hollis estimated that a minimum of \$50,000 a year would be required to operate a school of social work.<sup>1/</sup> At that time he estimated that, for economic operation and to justify its existence financially and educationally, 50 full time students and half as many part time students must be enrolled.

In a study made in 1957 by John Kidneigh, of "Factors Associated with the Size of Faculty in Schools of Social Work," he estimated that the smallest optimum size for economic and educational operation must be 40 full time students.<sup>2/</sup> This is based on the assumption that class size in central methods courses should be limited to approximately 20 students. Hence, 20 students in each of two years would make the optimum smallest size school.

In 1958 the range in the number of full time students enrolled in the 62 graduate schools was from 27 to 302 students. Only 9 schools enrolled fewer than 40 students and, of this number, 2 were newly accredited schools. Only 7 schools might, therefore, be considered, according to Mr. Kidneigh's figures, to be operating on an uneconomic basis.

If 40 students constitute the smallest optimum size for economic and educational operation of a school of social work, what is the minimum number of faculty required for a school of this size? The Manual of Accrediting Standards states that the faculty should be adequate in size, in training, and in experience to cover the areas of study included in the basic two-year curriculum.<sup>3/</sup> Mr Kidneigh, in his study, estimated that a core of 5 full time classroom faculty is considered to be the absolute minimum number required. The average full time classroom teaching assignment in a school offering 35 credits per term is estimated to be 6 credit hours per semester. Classroom teaching assignments and responsibilities account for less than half of the work load of a faculty member, for the nature of social work education demands that the work load include student advisement, research, community services, agency relations and other non-class teaching duties.

The minimum number of full time field instructors, or part time equivalent, is considered to be 5.7. Therefore, for a school of the optimum smallest size (40 full time students), a faculty of 11 full time positions, or part time equivalent, is considered minimally essential to cover class and field teaching responsibilities. At least half of this number should be full time to provide a core faculty whose entire time can be devoted to continuous coordination, development and maintenance of the school's educational program.

1/ Ernest V. Hollis and Alice L. Taylor, Social Work Education in the United States (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951).

2/ John Kidneigh, "Factors Associated with the Size of Faculty in Schools of Social Work," Social Work Education, Volume V, No. 3, June 1957.

3/ Manual of Accrediting Standards (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1953). Section 4440.

It is difficult to get at the actual cost of operating a school of social work because budgetary practices in universities vary considerably with respect to the kinds of items included in the budget. Many costs are normally hidden within the general university budget, such as costs for space for the school of social work, library services, maintenance, and so on. It was estimated by Hollis in 1951 that one quarter to one half of the institutional costs of professional education are buried in undifferentiated expenditures. Budgets for the 10 schools, included in the Kidneigh sampling, ranged from \$46,510 to \$230,000. The average was \$122,600. Mr. Kidneigh points out that the small size of the sampling makes this figure unrealistic as a national average.

### Sources of Income

In general, income for the schools of social work is from three sources: from general university funds, from tuition and fees, and from outside sources through special grants. Again the amount in each category varies widely from school to school. For example, one school in a privately controlled university with an enrollment of over 100 students has a budget of approximately \$180,000, of which 29% comes from general university funds, 43% from tuition, and 28% from grants from sources outside the budget. Another school supported by state funds with a budget of approximately \$210,000, and an enrollment of slightly over 50 students receives 80% of its income from university funds, and 20% from grants. This school does not indicate income from tuition and fees. The income from direct grants from outside sources, primarily government sources, such as NIMH and OVR, constitutes an important source of income for many schools, probably averaging approximately 25% or more. These grants make it possible for schools not only to increase the number of faculty to strengthen content and field instruction in the area of the curriculum for which the grant is given but also to enrich the total program of the school.

The question might well be raised at this point, if approximately 25% of the budgets of many schools is received from government grants, what has been the impact of such grants on the curriculum of graduate schools of social work? What are the advantages to the school, to the student, and to the agency? What dangers or disadvantages, if any, are there in such federal support of social work education?

### Tuition

The amount of income received from tuition varies widely between privately supported institutions and those supported by public funds. In 1951 Hollis estimated that in graduate schools in privately controlled universities tuition and fees cover approximately 60% of the cost of instruction, and in schools of social work in state universities, about 35% of the cost. Tuition costs vary from a low of \$100 per year in a state university for a state resident, to a high of \$600 per year for an out of state student. In graduate schools under private auspices, tuition ranges from \$350 per year to \$900 per year. Only one school makes no charge for tuition.

### Expenditures

Having considered briefly sources of income for the schools of social work, let us next consider how the school spends its budget. It is estimated that approximately two thirds of the budget in most graduate schools of social work is allocated to faculty salaries. How much are faculty paid?

Statistics on Social Work Education for 1958-59 gives a salary range for 135 full professors in the 55 graduate schools in the United States from \$6,250 to "over \$15,000," with the median salary for a full professor being \$9,250. In 1959 this figure was \$5,431. The 1958 figure, therefore, represents a gain of approximately 70% in the ten year period.

One hundred and ninety-five associate professors in 1958 earned a median salary of \$7,250, compared with \$4,500 in 1949, or a gain of 61%.



The 138 assistant professors received a median salary of \$6,250 as contrasted with \$3,750 in 1949, again an increase of approximately 66%.

All salaries in schools of social work have increased, therefore, more than 60% in the last 10 years. Yet schools report that they are frequently unable to attract and retain in teaching positions outstanding competent personnel, and may have to settle for less well qualified teachers. As Devereaux Josephs, Chairman of the President's Commission on Higher Education, says, "You can always find someone willing to teach at current salaries. Unfortunately, it is not enough to get someone. We need the best possible teachers and we should be ready to pay for them." In an interview in the New York Times, October 27, 1957, he said that one of the two central issues in the coming crisis in higher education is the need for higher pay for teachers because the most important need is for competent faculty. He estimated that this means a further increase in salaries of 50% during the next 5 years, because we cannot ignore the fact that low salaries at the present time tend to keep people out of teaching, or drive them out.

Comparison should be made between the salaries paid to faculty in schools of social work and salaries paid to faculty in other professions. The following figures are taken from Higher Education, the monthly publication of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, January 1959.

For a full clinical professor in medical school, the mean figure is \$13,630; for a dentist, \$9,630; for a full professor in a school of social work, \$9,330; for a doctor of veterinary medicine, \$9,220; nursing education, \$7,730. An associate clinical professor in medical school receives a mean salary of \$10,840 as contrasted with a mean salary for social work of \$7,460. An associate professor of veterinary medicine receives a mean salary of \$8,390; and in nursing education, \$7,230. Compared with these professions, Higher Education points out that social work faculty levels are roughly at midpoint among these professions.

#### Cost of Field Instruction to the School and to the Agency

Another major expenditure is the cost of field instruction to the school and to the agency. This is one of the most difficult figures to get and a true figure could probably not be obtained without a cost analysis study of the services contributed by the agency, and those contributed by the school in consultation, in supervisory seminars for agency supervisors, and in direct supervision by the school itself. The unscrambling of time costs under these circumstances is a major research undertaking. Any estimate of cost to the school or agency contained in this paper, therefore, although based on cost studies available and on figures submitted by a number of schools, must be regarded as primarily an illustration and, therefore, tentative and incomplete.

Reports available indicate a trend toward direct supervision of field instruction by the school itself. Many schools today have a percentage of students in field work units under the supervision of full time faculty supervisors paid by the school. The schools included in Kidneigh's study had an average of 40% of students in field work under full time school paid supervision. The average number of students assigned for field work per full time supervisor was six.

In Statistics on Social Work Education, November 1, 1958, 34 schools in the United States and Canada reported 92 faculty members giving full time to field supervision. Several schools consider it desirable that all students be under paid full time supervisors in order to maximize the quality of instruction and assure educational control of field experience. One school stated that it did not believe that social work education would reach its maximum quality until the school had greater control and command of field work facilities.

The increase in the number of supervisors of field units paid by the school adds appreciably to the salary item in the school's budget.

The type of field work plan developed by the school also affects the amount of money needed for the program. If the block plan of field work, for example, is used, or any other plan requiring travel for faculty members and field instructors, the budget should include an item to permit the school to establish regular continuing relationships with agency administrators and field instructors located outside the school community. Provision of travel expenses for field instructors to come to the campus, and maintenance while on the campus, is also regarded as a necessary budgetary item. The effectiveness of the various patterns of field instruction for the money expended is another question which demands study.

One school estimates that it costs the school \$1,000 per student per year just to cover the salary for a unit supervisor paid by the school. Another school estimates that it spends approximately \$800 per student for field instruction per academic year; and another \$1,450.

Every school also has some students in field work under agency paid staff whose full or part time is contributed to the school for the supervision of a field work unit or of one or two students each. Statistics in 1956 indicated that out of a total of 2,210 field work supervisors, 1,794 supervisors were devoting less than full time to student supervision and were paid by the agency. Most agencies feel that serving as a training center is worth as much as the agency pays for supervision and other costs incident to field instruction.

In attempting to estimate the cost of field instruction to the agency, two cost analyses studies were reviewed.

John G. Hill and Ralph Ormsby, in their study of Cost Analysis Method for Casework Agencies, made in 1953, suggest that to arrive at the cost figure to the agency for providing field instruction to one or more students, it is necessary to include all activities and expenses related to field work training and supervision of the student.<sup>4/</sup> Specific activities to be analyzed, therefore, include:

1. Orienting the new student to the work of the agency itself and the community in which it is located;
2. Supervision of the student's work in connection with cases or groups, in preparation of a thesis by the student based on agency data, and so on;
3. Agency staff conferences related to field work students or to the agency's field work program;
4. Meetings of student supervisors conducted by the agency or convened by the school;
5. Conferences with school representatives regarding a specific student or the general subject of placement in the agency;
6. Evaluation of student performance;
7. Preparation of report for the school;
8. Scholarships granted by the agency.

To these agency costs must also be added the cost for travel, clerical help, telephone, maintenance, and so on. Using this breakdown, Hill and Ormsby found that the cost to the agency per field work hour was estimated to be \$1.41. If a student spent two days a week in the agency, on the basis of these figures it would cost the agency \$576.00 per academic year. If three days were spent in field work, the cost to the agency would be \$880.12.

<sup>4/</sup> John G. Hill and Ralph Ormsby, Cost Analysis for Casework Agencies (Philadelphia: Family Service Association, 1953).

Another study, unpublished, of agency costs of field work training for graduate social work students, made by Hans Froehlick in 1956, estimates that the field supervisor spends five hours a week in direct work with each student and estimated one hour weekly for conferences with faculty advisors and in meetings.<sup>5/</sup> The study gives the time breakdown to support these figures. Estimating the worker's salary at \$5,800 a year, the cost becomes \$3.20 an hour. To this must be added administrative cost, heating, lighting, maintenance of facilities, clerical expenses, and travel expenses. On this basis the value of an agency hour is much higher. If the agency is reimbursed, as this agency was, by another agency at the rate of \$11.00 for one hour's interview (now considered a low figure), the amount of time spent on student supervision per student six hours a week, estimated at the same cost, would result in a cost to the agency of \$2,112 per academic year.

The salary cost alone to the agency for field instruction is high because workers with the experience and skills required to carry this supervisory responsibility are generally those receiving the higher salaries in the agency. In 1949 Hollis estimated the cost to the agency per student per academic year at \$381. Even though today's figures are inconclusive, it is clear that the cost to the agency for field instruction has more than doubled, even tripled, since that date.

On the basis of these expenditures for classroom instruction and field instruction, whether paid by the school or the agency, and other expenditures included in the budget, such as clerical salaries, library costs, maintenance, and so on, what do schools estimate it costs per academic year per student? One school in a state university gives the high cost of \$5,300. Another school in a state university estimates the cost to be \$2,200 per full time student, of which resident students pay only \$250 of this amount and out-of-state students pay \$600. Another state university estimates \$4,222, including tuition and fees. A school in a university under private auspices estimates a per capita cost of \$3,436. Another school under private auspices gives a figure of \$2,400. Perhaps the most reliable average figure is that compiled by Dr. Sunley, a member of the panel, from a sampling of 18 schools of social work covering cost data including field instruction borne by the university. The sampling, which included the six largest schools, the six smallest and six from among the median size schools, gave the average cost as \$2,054 per academic year per student, or 91% higher than the figure given in the Hollis-Taylor study. This bears out the statement made by the Department of Education that the cost of education has doubled within the past 10 years.

## II. Cost to the Student for One Year of Professional Education

The second major question to be discussed is, what is the cost to the student for one year of graduate professional education? Before looking at the actual cost figures, it may be helpful first to look at a few of the characteristics of students in schools of social work today and their significance for this discussion. For this purpose, reference is made to Dr. Milton Wittman's study of Scholarship Aid in Social Work Education.<sup>6/</sup> In his study of 800 students, Wittman found that approximately 50% were between the ages of 25 to 35, the median age being 27. Only approximately 30% were under 25. This fact is significant because it shows that the majority of the students do not come to graduate schools directly from undergraduate education, but generally from an unemployment experience and are in the age range where economic independence is the rule. Thirty-four percent of these students were married and many had dependents. Fifty-seven percent of the group were from homes where the income of the parents was under \$5,000. Only 12% had incomes over \$10,000. These figures, with the exception of family income which was not studied, are substantiated by the French-Rosen study of "Personnel Entering Social Work Employment from Schools of Social Work in 1957," which appears in Social Work Education, April 1958.

With these characteristics in mind, what is it estimated a student pays for one year of education?

<sup>5/</sup> Hans Froehlick, Study of Agency Costs of Field Work Training for Graduate Social Work Students (New York: Brooklyn Bureau of Social Service, 1956). Unpublished manuscript.

<sup>6/</sup> Milton Wittman, Scholarship Aid in Social Work Education (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1956).



In 1940 the cost to the student for all maintenance for one year of social work education was estimated to be \$780. In a study of expenditures of 50 full time out-of-town students attending Tulane University School of Social Work in the spring of 1950, Walter Kindelsperger estimated that the expenditures per student for the academic year, excluding tuition and fees, were \$1,289. When travel back and forth to home during the holidays was included, he stated it was not unreasonable to expect that the person who completed the requirements for a Master's degree must face a financial outlay of approximately \$4,000. Therefore, using Kindelsperger's figures, in the ten year period between 1940 and 1950, the cost to the student increased approximately 65%.

In a study made in November 1958 by the Budget Standard Service of the Community Council of Greater New York, prepared for the New York School of Social Work, the estimated cost, excluding tuition, is \$1,633.50 for a single student preparing two meals at home, and \$1,842.75 for a student eating meals out. The figure varies only slightly between the estimate for men and women. For a married student with a spouse working, the estimate is \$2,465.10. These estimates include housing, food, clothing, personal care, cleaning supplies, medical care, transportation to school and field work assignment, life insurance, laundry, contributions, recreation, and so on. Other schools estimate the cost to be from \$1,800 per student per academic year to \$2,400--a further increase of approximately 43% since 1950.

To what sources do students turn to finance social work education? The students list: scholarships, help from home, savings, veteran's benefits, part time employment, contribution from spouse, loans, government bonds, and so on.

Scholarships are today obviously the chief source of support for the majority of students, since on November 1, 1958, approximately 4,000 (or 79%) students currently enrolled full time in graduate schools of social work were receiving some form of financial aid; 2,772 from public funds, 1,145 from private funds, and 504 from school funds.

These figures show that, in general, the scholarship aid program in social work education is supported by the public and voluntary agencies employing social workers, and that school funds provide a relatively small portion of scholarship aid.

The postwar period saw a burgeoning of large scale public programs in the Veterans Administration, Public Health Service, especially the National Institute of Mental Health, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and so on. The period also saw an increase in the use of educational leave programs to provide leave to attend a graduate school of social work at full or reduced salaries for one or two years with commitment to return to the agency for one or two years of service. The grant, in general, includes tuition, maintenance while attending school, and travel expenses to school and back. Most states pay a stipulated amount monthly. Today, educational leave, especially in public agencies, is common practice. There is also an increased use of work study programs as a form of financial aid.

It is estimated by French and Rosen that approximately \$4,000,000 is contributed annually for social work scholarships and other forms of financial aid.

The system of support by voluntary and public agencies is now firmly built into the fabric of welfare and health programs, and scholarship aid, is now an essential part of the educational program for social work.

There are many aspects of this financial aid program which might well be scrutinized. Some questions which might be raised from the point of view of the student, the school and the agency are:

Are we moving into a scholarship culture in which a student expects to be offered a scholarship as an inducement to enroll as a graduate student in a school of social work?

Is financial aid essential for such a high number of students, 79% in 1958?

Should more scholarship aid be based on merit in order to encourage the intellectually superior student with the personality characteristics deemed desirable to enroll for professional social work education?

Should student loans rather than scholarships be considered as a way to finance higher education? Devereaux C. Josephs said in an article in the New York Times, October 27, 1957, that scholarships have become too attractive. He urges that student loan programs be established on local and state levels and that tuition also be increased. In his opinion, if students paid a greater share of their fees, they would appreciate their education more than they do now. Are loan funds an answer to meet the needs of graduate students in schools of social work? What would be the effect of still higher tuition fees?

What has been the effect of existing policies on scholarship aid by reasons of restrictions on recipients and conditions of acceptance? What impact has the amount and kind of scholarship aid available exerted on the content and structure of graduate education? What effect have the large federal programs which provide both scholarship aid and faculty support had on social work education?

And lastly, what would be the advantages and disadvantages of coordinated planning and organization of scholarship aid on a national level to strengthen and extend the existing structure of financial aid?

### III. The Role of the Community

What is the role of the community in supporting and financing social work education? It is the community which, in the end, bears the financial responsibility for the quantity and quality of social services available to its citizens. It, therefore, has a direct stake in the selection and preparation of personnel for these services, and has a very important role to play in creating a climate which fosters a conviction about the importance of professional education and encourages its financial support.

The Committee on Careers in Social Work, with the endorsement of the United Community Funds and Councils of America, suggests that the attack on this problem should be a community-wide effort in which every agency interested in improving the quality of its services cooperates. A recruitment program and a scholarship program should go hand-in-hand. Some united funds and chests already make provision for a scholarship item, on request, in the budgets of some agencies. The plan recommended, however, suggests that funds be allocated by the fund or chest for scholarships and for educational leave by such means as setting aside a percentage of the total funds raised, or designating that unspent salary items revert to a scholarship fund, or by securing grants from local foundations. The long range objective of such a program is to raise the standards of professional personnel and, in this way, increase the effectiveness of health and welfare services in the total community. The commitment, in this case, is to return to the community and not to any specified agency within the community. Some united funds have already established this type of community program. St. Paul, for example, one of the first to establish such a program in 1951, reports that since that date it has had 174 man years of professional service from recipients of its scholarship program. It considers it a sound business proposition that has brought results to the entire community.

### IV. Other Sources of Funds for Social Work Education

The last question which realistically might be raised is, are schools of social work taking full advantage of other sources of financial support and getting their fair share of funds available? How could they work more effectively toward this? Would a fund for social work education similar to the fund for medical education be an effective device toward securing increased support for graduate schools of social work?

In an article in the New York Times on March 8, 1959, the Council on Financial Aid to Education reported that American higher education's fastest growing source of support in the last 15 years has been private gifts. In a study of this period, gifts have increase



nearly 800% or to a total of \$411 million. Corporations gave a total of over \$80 million to institutions of higher learning during the year 1955-56. Half of this consisted of scholarship grants. Alumni gifts in 1957-58 increased 29%.

It is estimated that local, federal and state governments contribute approximately 50% of the total operating budgets of institutions of higher education. A study, "A New Basis for Support for Higher Education," made by Teachers College, Columbia University, and reported by Benjamin Fine in the New York Times, October 21, 1956, recommends that a greater share of the cost of higher education be assumed by business, industry, philanthropy, and the federal government. Society should help foot the bill. It is the nation and the people who are the chief benefactors of higher education.

These, then, are some of the realities we face in financing the high cost of social work education. Even though the data are incomplete in many areas, they serve to highlight some of the real issues and dilemmas facing social work education today and the responsibilities all those who have a stake in the preparation of more competent social work share in working toward effective solutions.

Discussant: Emil Sunley, Director, School of Social Work, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado

As pointed out so ably by Miss Neely, professional schools of social work, like other integral parts of American colleges and universities, have been caught in the ever-spiraling costs of higher education. Dr. Ernest Hollis and Alice Taylor, authors of the volume entitled Social Work Education in the United States, said that social work costs, measured by either capital outlay or current operating costs, stand close to the median of all professional schools. It was their belief that the cost to a university of a program of social work education would amount to \$1,075 per full time student for an academic year. This did not include an additional \$381 per student per year for field work instruction provided by the social agencies. However, since this volume was published in 1951, it is safe to say that the data were gathered about a decade ago, so that one of the interesting questions relates to what these university costs may be today or how much of an increase has there been the last ten years.

There has been no such comprehensive study since 1951; the current Curriculum Study does not deal with this matter; therefore, a recent attempt was made to obtain some estimates from the deans of selected schools. Inquiries were sent to nineteen (or one-third) of the deans of American schools including the six smallest schools, the six largest and seven median-sized schools. Seventeen of these deans replied that these university costs for the current year were \$2,054 per full time student for an academic year or 91% higher than the average cost of \$1,075 ten years ago. The range was \$1,323 to \$3,300 per student per year. For the benefit of the researchers who may be present and ready to challenge the accuracy of such data, may it be said that this method of research is known as that of the "Judgment of the Deans." In all seriousness, these data, even if a bit rough, are indicative of what has happened to the cost of social work education from the point of view of the schools. Among the seventeen schools providing cost data for the current academic year, the four largest schools thought that their average costs were \$2,110; for the six smallest schools, \$1,961; and for the seven median-sized schools, \$2,101. It is also interesting to note that one of the smaller schools reported a situation of declining costs because the student enrollment was increasing while the school costs of operation were remaining approximately the same. At the other extreme was the dean of a middle-sized school who thought that the costs per full time student were over \$5,000 a year. However, this dean included several things which should probably be excluded so that a more acceptable estimate of costs for this school would be \$3,148.

For some people, these data, reflecting the increased cost of professional education for the schools, may be a bit alarming, so that some words of caution are necessary. Such cost data were based upon a sample of the schools only; that the data, at best, were an

estimate; and that such data are meaningless unless compared with the rising cost per full time student for higher education throughout the United States. Even more important would be a comprehensive study to indicate how these costs for schools of social work compare with comparable increases for the medical schools, law schools, and those of other professions. We might discover, for example, that even though these costs have increased 91% in the last ten years, we will occupy a median position, when compared with similar schools for other professions, as indicated by the Hollis-Taylor study of a decade ago.

What effects have these increased costs of social work education had upon the schools of social work?

Such an inquiry directed to the nineteen deans, those of the six largest schools, the six smallest schools and seven median-sized schools. On the basis of their responses, there had not been, during the last three years, as much adversity as one might expect. In fact, some deans pointed out that there were definite advantages in having a considerably higher operating cost per full time student in that it was easier to hold current faculty members, to provide for much higher faculty salaries, and to recruit new faculty members.

On the other hand some negative factors, of course, are involved. For example, one dean pointed out that "there would be trouble in the future, if costs continued to increase"; three deans said that the work loads of faculty had increased and this in turn had also meant less research on the part of the faculty and not as much activity of faculty in accepting positions of community leadership. Perhaps the most serious difficulty was that of obtaining money for the expansion of faculty, especially for new and developmental areas. At least four deans called attention to this problem, especially as it related to the establishment of new faculty positions. Two deans said that the rising costs had made it tough to employ outstanding faculty, both classroom and field work instructors, and another pointed out that such costs had made it difficult to do anything about an inadequate physical plant. Lastly, one dean said he needed more money for better salaries of faculty having the rank of Professor or Associate Professor, and another said that his high operating costs made him vulnerable to attack by the state legislators or anyone seeking to discredit a public investment in higher education. In summary, one must admit that the financial situation of schools, resulting from the rising costs of professional social work education, although not too alarming as yet, nevertheless is sufficiently serious to cause concern.

In view of the rising cost of professional social work education, are the schools now operating up to capacity?

The response is in the affirmative. In fact, enrollment this year, a total of 4,942 full time students, is the highest ever achieved. The last four year period (1954-1958) has shown an increase each year in the number of students culminating in this year's record enrollment for the Canadian and American schools. Since the costs of professional education have increased substantially, an interesting question is whether or not, with current staff, can more students be accepted? When the deans were queried in 1955, the estimated potential capacity with existing classroom and field work faculty was 5,175 full time students. This would indicate that the schools are near capacity unless facilities are expanded, but as was pointed out earlier, the deans are reporting that it is more and more difficult to obtain funds for new faculty positions. Of even more concern is the fact that the proposed \$2,500,000 for the education of public assistance personnel makes no grants to the schools of social work. This is serious, and will pose a real problem with reference to schools being able to educate an expanding number of public welfare personnel. In view of these circumstances, it is hoped that much thought will be given to developing this program, if established, to include grants to the schools as well as to the state departments of public welfare, so that it, as well as those for other contemplated developmental areas, may constitute additional sources of financial assistance for the professional schools of social work.

Since the costs of professional social work education have increased considerably for the schools, is it likely that the schools will attempt to obtain more income from student tuition?

This is a real possibility, especially on the part of privately supported universities, since university administrators, when confronted with rising costs, often think of increasing the cost of tuition. In fact, tuition costs in the schools of social work have increased steadily. If one looks at the situation as of the fall of 1958, one notes that for the American schools, tuition costs ranged from no charge in one state university to \$450 a semester as a maximum. On the other hand, even when a student pays as much as \$900 a year for tuition and the annual university cost of his education, as roughly estimated by a selected group of deans, is \$2,054, one can readily see that this is only 43.8% of such costs. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that tuition costs are likely to increase, especially in some of the privately supported universities as well as some of the state universities currently having very low tuition costs. In fact, two deans out of the seventeen, reporting current cost data, revealed that they planned another tuition increase starting in September of this year.

Furthermore, the low-cost schools in terms of tuition no longer have the advantage of a few years ago with reference to attracting students in that there is a marked trend for student scholarships, traineeships, and stipends to include the cost of tuition as an additional or supplementary grant. On the other hand, even though every student admitted is a potential loss in terms of cost to a professional school of social work, there is no question but that tuition income is, and will continue to be, an important source of support for some of the schools of social work.

Is there likelihood that the schools of social work will receive any substantial financial assistance from the regional commissions on higher education?

We should look briefly at the Regional Commissions on Higher Education, especially the Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Georgia, and the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado, to determine whether or not the regional contracts are or will be of any great assistance to the schools in meeting the costs of social work education. As of this year, the Southern Board has only twenty-three social work students under its contractual provisions with \$750 per student being paid by the sending state to the school of registration. However, there are but two sending states, and only four schools of social work with such students enrolled. These provisions have been in effect for several years, yet only a few students are included so that it would appear that regional contracts are not likely to be a major source of income for our schools.

With regard to the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, the situation is even more discouraging since social work is not even included under the current contracts. The situation in the West is similar to that in the South where "social work contracts have not been as successful as those for medicine, dentistry and veterinary medicine primarily because there has never been the same relationship between student demand and available places in schools of social work as exists in other professional areas." Therefore, as one looks at this experience in the South, as well as the present situation in the West, one cannot be too encouraged about great financial assistance being obtained from the contracts under interstate compacts. Furthermore, the contracts do not make any provision for financial assistance to compact students who would continue, as is so evident today, to need traineeships, stipends or scholarships. Then, too, the amount received by the school for a contract student, \$750 in the South, is totally inadequate in terms of the current cost of education for a social work student, and it is an evasive amount dependent upon the registration of a contract student in a specific school.

Are the educational grants of Federal agencies of great help to the schools in meeting their financial problems?

Of course this question will be answered in an affirmative and positive way. Tremendous assistance, since the fall of 1948, has been received from the National Institute of Mental Health for the development of further expansion of programs of psychiatric social work,



social group work in psychiatric settings, school social work, third year and doctoral programs. Beginning in the fall of 1959 such assistance will be extended to some additional practice areas relevant to mental health and including a few significant social-problem areas in a broadened program of professional social work education.

During the current year fifty schools of social work are receiving NIMH grants for psychiatric social work, seventeen for school social work, and nine for social group work in psychiatric settings. These grants total nearly \$3 million dollars and include eight hundred traineeships as well as funds for classroom and field work instruction so that one can readily see that such assistance to schools of social work is substantial. In fact, if these grants, as well as those from other sources, were not available, a few schools would probably have difficulty in remaining open. One is tremendously impressed to note also that during the past ten years a total of 2,100 social work students have received NIMH traineeships at the Master's and post-Master's levels of education.

While speaking of Federal grants comment should also be made on the great help received from the Children's Bureau and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. The program of the Children's Bureau is an old one which permits the granting of educational leave stipends by public child welfare programs so that such staff members may attend schools of social work. Last year approximately \$815,000 was spent for this purpose and \$1,215,000 was budgeted by these child welfare agencies for the current year. A rough estimate indicates that probably 500 staff members participated in this program last year and that 750 will do so this year. Although this is a stipend program only, and no grants are made to schools for faculty or other costs, yet it is comparable in size to the student traineeship program of NIMH.

The educational program of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is a new one, the first grants having been made to schools of social work in the spring of 1955. This program is focused on strengthening the teaching of rehabilitation principles for all students and increasing the supply of social workers for rehabilitation settings. This year, educational grants totaling \$515,000 are being received by 31 schools of social work and approximately \$250,000 of this amount is being used for 130 student traineeships.

One can readily see that if all of these public grants are added together, excluding the large grants for educational programs supported by voluntary contributions such as that of the National Foundation in the area of medical social work, that the schools of social work, as well as students, are profiting greatly by these several governmental programs to enhance the supply of professional social workers. A total of three and three-fourths millions of dollars is not a small amount of money.

Discussant: Mrs. Louise N. Mumm, Staff Consultant, National Social Welfare Assembly, New York, New York

Social work education appears to be different from other graduate education in several respects; two year graduate work--field work concurrently; we do not want students to work and the agencies are heavily involved in the training process itself.

One dean of a school of social work has said that if it were not for the social agencies and their scholarship programs the schools would have to close because there would not be enough students.

As I see it, we have different kinds of students and probably different sets of problem related to them.

1. The nature of social welfare today, produces one of these students.

We are an emerging profession. Not more than one-fourth of those practicing are graduates of a school of social work. Not all agencies seriously have such education as their objective for staff. Some do--take public welfare, for example.

As an emerging profession in today's climate there is more and more demand for welfare service (that in itself gives some positive aspects of the public image of the social worker, as amorphous as it may be). To meet these demands--especially the mandatory one of public welfare, we are forced to employ those with less training than we would like. Therefore, agencies select individuals on merit from within their own staff, to send for more education, under scholarship or educational leave which will result in promotion and generally higher standards of service. This group in some schools of social work represents the majority of students which is sound and good. Financing this education is done out of agency funds--sometimes salary is paid as though the employee were working, sometimes it is arranged on a scholarship fund plan.

## 2. The shortage of personnel

The needs of the expanding field, the shortage of youth, the keen competition among all fields for the best has produced a shortage of personnel. Scholarship is being used as a recruiting device to attract youth to the social work field. William McGlothlin, in an unpublished-as-yet book, describing education for the profession, says with regard to recruiting, "The profession and schools have two compulsions: (1) to fill available places and (2) to raise the standards of the profession by raising the levels of admission." He goes on to say, "Recruitment has a further intent. A number of highly qualified students never get to college and consequently to professional schools, because they lack motivation and money."

What is wrong with us as a profession that we think the bait always must be an outright grant of money? True, social work salaries have not been good, and some still are low, but we are improving that immeasurably. Why do we not put financial need as a criterion for first year students? What is wrong when these things happen: a dean reports that although he inquired recently of a first year applicant about his father's salary, when the young man said \$25,000 to \$30,000, the dean raised no question regarding family feeling about their ability to finance the son's education? Another school reports that a student said his family could finance him, but he "wanted to be on his own,"--and that meant asking for a scholarship. One dean said that pressures are put upon a student to take a scholarship so that he will, because of commitments attached, have a guaranteed job to go to when he graduates.

Is it not high time that we pause in our race for personnel and examine what we are doing to those coming into the social work profession? We, who know so much about motivation and attitudes seem to be in the dark ages of "charity, sweet charity" when it comes to dealing with our potential personnel. What dignity is being conveyed to the profession and to the individuals in it, if the attitude is allowed to get across that social work must buy all its new members through scholarships? While one can counter with the realities of cost, low salaries, families, responsibilities, and so on, does help always have to be a gift irrespective?

While there is very little talk today about loans for education in social work, twenty-five years ago this was a common way. Schools had loan funds, benevolent individuals made this possible, and so on. A number of prominent persons in the field of social work had such loans and paid them back. The medical school catalogs invariably carried an item on loans that were substantial for education, not the smaller emergency need. Again, except for Harvard, every school had such a fund. These seemed, by and large, to be restricted to second and third years and in varying amounts. The stipulations were interesting--no interest to be paid while in graduate school; to be paid within a five or ten year period with an interest rate of 2% usually specified.

A recent item from the New York Times, coming from the Commissioner of the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, stated, "No one knows how many co-eds would sign up for new Federal college student loans. There's a good reason: No one knows how many girls would decide that a debt of \$3,000 or \$4,000 might discourage a boy from marrying them. Mr. Derthick explained to a House Appropriations Committee that co-eds have been 'notoriously reluctant' in the past to go into debt because they feel it might be an impediment to marriage."

What kind of psychology is this? Is it not possible to have both scholarships and loans? We seem to get so rigid and unrealistic on an "either-or" basis. One instance is cited where a student needed only \$300 for the year to see him through and applied to an agency to help. The agency turned him down because their scholarship was for \$1,000 and he didn't qualify on amount of need. This situation probably could have been either a loan or a grant. As social work salaries improve, and if it is true that people are promoted more rapidly, thus improving professional and economic status, why not think of the value of loans?

How many social agencies have ever approached an individual who had a scholarship ten or twenty years ago, and asked that individual to help specifically to repay his opportunity by making a (substantial) contribution to furthering education of currently needy students? Just as much as a "scholarship-fellowship" culture, we are living in a "time payment" culture. We buy our house, car, washing machine, furniture, TV, and so on,--necessities and luxuries we have come to regard as necessities--on time. If education is a necessity now, had we not better think of time payment through loans for it?

The money secured in social work for social work education is not easy to come by. Is there not a responsibility for using it in the most economical as well as most productive way?

With regard to scholarships and fellowships in other professions, I have done some independent research about financial aid for graduate work in other "helping" professions. Veterinary medicine, business and engineering make little mention of scholarships, although some are available. At the other extreme, 70-odd percent of full time social work students received some form of financial aid.

Medicine has some fellowships and scholarships, although not as numerous as in other fields. A random sample of 20 universities (of the 82 accredited) in the same number of states on medicine was examined. Every one had a section on financial aid. Not all differentiated between funds administered by the university and by other groups available to the student. Harvard stated that "there are no scholarships or fellowships within the medical school."

Several states had grants from the state, a few or many primarily to encourage rural applicants and persons to practice in rural areas (University of South Carolina, Pennsylvania, Vermont). As in social work, some were for first year, many more for later years. Criteria for entrance were "needy and deserving," "worthy and deserving," "need and ability," (first year) "unusual promise." For other than the first year it always contained such statements as "high academic rates" plus "promise" plus "need."

As for law schools, practically all schools have a little subsidy. One important member of the bar said, there is less urge to get persons into the field because it is overcrowded. Only a small percent of each graduating class actually engages in the practice of law.

In religion my research covered only the Protestants where there are many scholarships. Union Theological Seminary in New York City tried but could not continue to have an open door policy as Princeton has, that no one was ever denied admission because of finances. A listing of the accredited schools includes in each instance something about scholarships and fellowships, and the amounts, which run from \$100 to \$2000 for scholarships, with \$270 per month highest; fellowships run to \$2650. There was no reference to criteria for scholarships as in the medical profession.

Information about nursing relates to graduate school only, as this is comparable to social work education. This is a shortage field, as is social work, and nursing is short of "leaders." Therefore, there is great interest in graduate training in public health. There is one difference between social work and nursing, in that all the nurses taking graduate work have been working, some for many years, and are giving up employment. There are many scholarships and fellowships from various sources, including federal traineeships from several agencies for nurses. Loans are also available, and are given in relation to



a combination of need and merit, with a maximum of \$500 per year for 2 years. Repayment terms of two loan funds included 5% interest in one, and 2% discounted for another.

National League for Nursing reports that application blanks carry a question asking to what extent the individual can meet the cost of training, and the applicant is required to submit a budget for the total period. Scholarships are given on the premise that the person does not have to use all her resources, and no proof of need is requested. Grants are for full maintenance. For example, an American Association of University Women fellowship is from \$2,000 to \$4,000 per year, National League for Nursing, from \$3,000 to \$5,000 per year. The Public Health Service grant adds \$360 for twelve months for each legal dependent. Other grants run from \$1,000 to \$3,000.

Family casework grants for professional education include the Family Service Association of America grants from their member and pre-member agencies. Virtually all of them had commitments attached and spelled out; only one required professional promise and financial need. It may be assumed that two or three more might really have a "need" clause as persons must be referred from school accepting.

See the difference between social work and medicine, for example.

### Salaries

### Comparisons

The hue and cry is that our salaries are low.

Yes, they are lower than many salaries in industry, and professions like medicine and law where the self-employed can gross considerable.

Coincidentally, medicine and social work had a salary study the same year, 1950.

Remember, doctors have 3 - 4 years, usually 4, undergraduate, 4 years graduate, and 1 to 3 years internship (3-5 for a speciality).

Remember also, salary study of social workers 1950 included those with graduate training and those without.

1950	-	Doctors--private practice	Av. Net Income	\$11,058
		Doctors	Av. Salary	7,678
		Av. in all fields of social welfare		2,960
1958	-	FSAA figure - caseworker (trained) av.		5,354
		Beg. engineer - \$472.00 per mon. (quoted recently)		

Current salaries of doctors in VA run \$8,000 - \$13,500

In United Mine Worker Hospitals (remote areas) an experienced doctor, willing to go there gets \$20,000.

SAVE THE DATES

COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

ANNUAL PROGRAM MEETINGS

1960 JANUARY 20 - 23 OKLAHOMA CITY

1961 FEBRUARY 1 - 4 MONTREAL

1962 JANUARY 17 - 20 ST. LOUIS

1963 JANUARY 23 - 26 BOSTON

